	Case 2:23-cv-00908-KJM-JDP Documer	nt 34 F	Filed 05/23/24	Page 1 of 3	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	BRANDON R. JOHNSON,	Case	e No. 2:23-cv-09	908 KJM JDP (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,				
13	v.	ORI	DER		
14	WARDEN, et al.,				
15	Defendants.				
16		J			
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action seeking relief				
18	under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided				
19	by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.				
20	On January 16, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which				
21	were served on plaintiff, and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the				
22	findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has filed				
23	objections to the findings and recommendations.				
24	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this				
25	court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having reviewed the file, the court adopts the				
26	findings and recommendations in part.				
27	As the magistrate judge notes, plaintiff has not sufficiently alleged a failure to train claim				
28	under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See F. & R. at 3-4, ECF No. 20; see also Flores v. County of Los				
		1			

Case 2:23-cv-00908-KJM-JDP Document 34 Filed 05/23/24 Page 2 of 3

Angeles, 758 F.3d 1154, 1158 (9th Cir. 2014). Additionally, plaintiff cannot state a due process				
claim based on the alleged false allegations alone, without explaining how the false allegations				
deprived him of a constitutionally protected liberty or property interest. See F. & R. at 4;				
Wilkinson v. Austin, 545 U.S. 209, 221 (2005) ("The Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process				
Clause protects persons against deprivations of life, liberty, or property; and those who seek to				
invoke its procedural protection must establish that one of these interests is at stake."); Davis v.				
Macomber, No. 19-0848, 2019 WL 2464531, at *6 (E.D. Cal. June 13, 2019) (existence of				
alleged false reports alone does not support due process claim). Although "there is a clearly				
established constitutional due process right not to be subjected to criminal charges on the basis of				
false evidence that was deliberately fabricated by the government," Devereaux v. Abbey,				
263 F.3d 1070, 1074–75 (9th Cir. 2001), plaintiff does not allege he was subject to criminal				
charges based on defendants' fabricated reports, cf. Rubalcava v. City of San Jose, No. 20-04191,				
2024 WL 1336456, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2024) (due process rights implicated when				
prosecutor relied on allegedly fabricated police reports when deciding to prosecute plaintiff).				

However, the magistrate judge has not considered whether plaintiff has sufficiently stated:

1) a § 1983 claim for ratification of an unconstitutional action, First Am. Compl. at 12, 15; see, e.g., Christie v. Iopa, 176 F.3d 1231, 1238 (9th Cir. 1999) (discussing ratification); 2) a state law claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress against defendant French, First Am. Compl. at 17–18; and 3) a claim against defendants Luca, Reimche, and Brown for failure to intervene, id. at 18–19; see, e.g., Cunningham v. Gates, 229 F.3d 1271, 1289 (9th Cir. 2000) (discussing duty to intercede). The matter is referred back to the magistrate judge for consideration of these claims.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations, ECF No. 20, are adopted in part;
- 2. Plaintiff's excessive force claim against defendants Reimche and Luca, delayed medical care claim against defendants Reimche and Luca, failure to train claim against defendants Leikauf, El Dorado Sheriff and El Dorado County, and due process claim against defendants French, Reimche, Luca and Brown for the alleged false reports are dismissed for

failure to state a claim; and 3. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate for consideration of the remaining claims as noted in this order and for all further pretrial matters. DATED: May 23, 2024.

Case 2:23-cv-00908-KJM-JDP Document 34 Filed 05/23/24 Page 3 of 3